



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,176	08/02/2006	Paul Adriaan Van Der Schaaf	LS/95-23017/A/PCT	5060
324	7590	01/17/2008		
JoAnn Villamizar			EXAMINER	
Ciba Corporation/Patent Department			SHITERENGARTS, SAMANTHA L	
540 White Plains Road				
P.O. Box 2005			ART UNIT	
Tarrytown, NY 10591			PAPER NUMBER	
			4131	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			01/17/2008	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/588,176

**Applicant(s)**

VAN DER SCHAAF ET AL.

**Examiner**

SAMANTHA SHTERENGARTS

**Art Unit**

4131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20,35 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20,35 and 36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20, 35, and 36 are currently pending in the instant application and are subject to a lack of unity requirement.

#### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

**Group I**, claims 1, 2, 21-26, 33-35, and 36, drawn to crystalline polymorph A compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group II**, claims 3-5 and 27 drawn to crystalline 1-butanol solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group III**, claims 6-8 and 28, drawn to crystalline anisole solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group IV**, claims 9-11 and 29, drawn to crystalline isopropanol solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group V**, claims 12-14 and 30 drawn to crystalline ethyl methyl ketone solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group VI**, claims 15-17 and 31 drawn to crystalline tetrahydrofuran solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group VII**, claims 18-20 and 32 drawn to crystalline 1,4-dioxane solvate compounds and processes of manufacture of the formula, 4-[[3-[2-(dimethylamino)ethyl]-1H-indol-5-yl]methyl]-2oxazolidinone.

**Group VIII**, claims 38, drawn to methods of using crystalline solvate compounds

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

An international application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, the inclusion of those inventions in one international application is only permitted if all inventions are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1). With respect to a group of inventions claimed in an international application, unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since, under 37 CFR 1.475(a)

Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

Groups I-VII lack unity of invention since under 37 CFR 1.475: the technical feature corresponding to the claims is Zolmitriptan as a polymorph. This technical feature is not a special technical feature because it fails to define a contribution over the prior art as can be seen, for example, by US 20020048610, which discloses, for example, pharmaceuticals such as Zolmitriptan that can crystallize into more than one polymorphic form. Therefore, claims 1-20, 35, and 36, are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept and there is a lack of unity of invention because they lack a special technical feature as the technical feature present fails to define a contribution over the prior art. Accordingly, unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be prior. Additionally, the vastness of the claimed subject matter, and the

complications in understanding the claimed subject matter imposes a serious burden on any examination of the claimed subject matter without restriction.

Therefore, since the claims do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and lack the same or corresponding special technical feature, the claims lack unity of invention and should be limited to only a product or a method of use.

Furthermore, in regards to Groups I-VII, even if unity of invention under 37 CFR 1.475(a) is not considered lacking, which it is, under 37 CFR 1.475(b) a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and a process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product, and a use of said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

And according to 37 CFR 1.475(c): if an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b), unity of invention might not be present.

Therefore, since the claims are drawn to more than a product and a method of use, and according to 37 CFR 1.475(e): the determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claims.

The claims, therefore, lack unity of invention.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to Samantha Shterengarts whose telephone number is (571)270-5316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SAMANTHA SHTERENGARTS/  
Examiner, Art Unit 4131

/JANET L. ANDRES/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 4131